APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,751	04/30/2001	Bernhard J. Scholz	GE1-0004US	3458

21718   7590   07/10/2008
LEE & HAYES PLLC
SUITE 500
421 W RIVERSIDE
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhpto@leehayes.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/845,751	SCHOLZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 March 2008*.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-5,19,21-38 and 40-43* is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) *19 and 21-31* is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-5,32-38 and 40-43* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/08*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the response to the amendment filed on 3/5/2008.

This action is made Final.

2.   In the amendment, claims 6, and 20 have been canceled. 1-5, and 19, 21-38, and 40-43

are pending in the case. Claims 1, 19, 23, 32, and 38 are independent claims.

Drawings

3.   The drawings filed on 4/30/2001 have been approved by the Examiner.

Information Disclosure Statement

4.   The IDSs filed on 3/5/2008 have been considered by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

5.   Claims 1-5, and 43 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1

recites 'the source code from definition' line 7. It seems that Applicants meant 'the source code

form definition'. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
   subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7.   Claims 1-5, and 43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

8.   Claim 1 recites the limitation "the non-custom field" in line 10. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The 'non-custom field' is found later, and not

previous to this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

   (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
   described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter
   sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have
   been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art
   to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in
   which the invention was made.

10.   Claims 32-38, and 40-42 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Raz (Pat.# 6,292,827, 9/18/2001, filed on 6/20/1997), in view of Laura Lemay's

Workshop JavaScript, Lemay et al, hereinafter Lemay, 1996, Sams.net, pp.132-137.

         Regarding independent claim 32, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms

into HTML form documents to be used and filled out by a user—*form definition written in*

source code defining a form to be generated (col.12, lines 36-49).

         Moreover, Raz teaches that after converting the forms, validation functions are added, by

a forms generator—*automatically--* to the HTML form document fields for verifying the data

input into those fields — *identifying and adding validation code that, when executed based on an*

input corresponding to the field, *validates whether the associated restrictions are satisfied ; and*

automatically adding the identified validation code to the new form definition, such that a user

input in a form created from the new form definition is validated (col.12, lines 36-49). In other

words, the converted HTML-coded form(s) is received, and then validation functions

associated—*one or more associated input restrictions--* with the HTML form fields, are added to

the form. Raz fails to explicitly disclose: *automatically identifying a replacement non-custom*

tag, automatically adding the identified replacement non-custom tag to a new form definition.

However, Lemay teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms along with tags—

identifying and adding a replacement non-custom tag. The validation functions are added within

HTML tags, and the functions indicate an attribute, such as "ValidLength", and length value not

to be exceeded (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added the validation tags of Lemay and

functions to the form fields of Raz, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving

immediate feedback without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a

user to save time and trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created

HTML tags—*custom tags*.

Regarding claim 33, which depends on claim 32, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. After converting the forms, validation functions are added to the

HTML form fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails to

explicitly disclose: *adding to the new form definition, a reference to invoke the added validation*

code. However, Lemay teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms using a function

call, such as "function Validate ()" page 134, line 3-- *reference to the added validation code*. The

validation functions are added within HTML tags (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the

validation reference to the converted form of Raz with well-known HTML function calls taught

by Lemay, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback

without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and

trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags.

Regarding claim 34, which depends on claim 32, Raz teaches that after converting the

forms—*receiving* HTML *form definition*, validation functions are added to the HTML form

fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails to explicitly

disclose: *adding the each of the non-custom tags to the new form definition*. However, Lemay

teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms along with tags— *identifying and adding a*

replacement non-custom tag. The validation functions are added within HTML tags, and the

functions indicate an attribute, such as "ValidLength", and length value not to be exceeded (page

133, lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to have added the validation tags of Lemay and functions to the form fields

of Raz, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback without

having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and trouble

by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags—*custom tags*.

Regarding claim 35, which depends on claim 32, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added

to the converted form fields for verifying the data input by a user into those fields (col.12, lines

36-49).

Regarding claim 36, which depends on claim 32, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added

to the converted form fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49).

Raz fails to explicitly disclose: *each input custom tag includes one or more attributes that*

identify the one or more associated restrictions, and wherein each of the one or more attributes

includes an indication of the attribute and a corresponding value for that data input

corresponding to the tag is to be restricted to. However, Lemay teaches adding validation

functions to HTML forms. The validation functions are added within HTML tags, and the

functions indicate an attribute, such as "ValidLength", and length value not to be exceeded (page

133, lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to include the validation functions of Raz within attributes of Lemay,

because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback without having

to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and trouble by

inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags.

Regarding claim 37, which depends on claim 32, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of

paper forms into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added

to the converted form fields for verifying the data input into those fields–*execution code to add

the identified validation code to the new form definition* (col.12, lines 36-49).

Regarding independent claim 38, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms

into HTML forms, having fields for entering data. After converting the forms, validation

functions are added, by a forms generator—*automatically--* to the HTML form fields—*a first

portion identifying an input field--* for verifying the data input into those fields — *a second

portion identifying validation code to be added to a page to enforce the one or more restrictions*

(col.12, lines 36-49).

Regarding claim 40, which depends on claim 38, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms into HTML forms, having fields, such as an account field, for typing an account number (col.12, lines 36-49).

Regarding claim 41, which depends on claim 38, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms into HTML forms. During the automatic conversion, validation functions are added to the converted form fields for verifying the data input into those fields (col.12, lines 36-49). Raz fails to explicitly disclose: *one or more attributes and for each attribute and associated value for the attribute*. However, Lemay teaches adding validation functions to HTML forms. The validation functions are added within HTML tags, and the functions indicate an attribute, such as "ValidLength", and length value not to be exceeded (page 133, lines 17-page 18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the validation functions of Raz within attributes of Lemay, because Lemay teaches the saving of trouble, and receiving immediate feedback without having to wait on a server (page 132, lines 7-10). Thus, allowing a user to save time and trouble by inserting the Javascript validation functions in the created HTML tags.

Regarding claim 42, which depends on claim 38, Raz teaches the automatic conversion of paper forms into HTML forms, having fields, such as an account field, for typing—*user input--* an account number (col.12, lines 36-49).

Response to Arguments

11.   Applicant's arguments filed 3/5/2008 have been fully considered but they are partly

persuasive. Regarding claims 1, 19, 23, the Applicants indicate that the prior art fails to teach the

amended claims (pages 10-14). The Examiner concurs the prior art fails to teach the newly

amended claims. These claims are allowed except for some outstanding issues as outlined above.

  Regarding claims 32-38, and 40-42, Mr. David Lee indicated in a telephonic message that the

Applicant was amenable to canceling these claims in order to place the case in condition for

allowance, in response to a conversation with the Examiner on 6/18/08. However, Mr. Lee also

remarked that he wanted to further discuss this issue. The Examiner was running up against a

deadline for acting on this case, and therefore the anticipated conversation did not take place

before the deadline. However, the Applicant is welcome to add the recommended amendments in

order to place the application in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

12.   Claims 19, 21-31 are allowed.

Conclusion

13.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

I.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please

allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, go to http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have any questions about

access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866

217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, please call 800-786-9199 or 571

272-1000 (USA or Canada).

        Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
                              Commissioner for Patents
                                 P.O. Box 1450
                Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
        Or faxed to:

- **(571)-273-8300** (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

/CESAR B PAULA/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178

7/8/2008